

- B1
Cmt
42. (New) A document repository system allowing electronic retrieval of documents related to a plurality of entities, each of the entities conventionally referred to utilizing a plurality of different symbols comprising:
a processor, wherein the processor is adapted to:
receive a plurality of input symbols, each pertaining to a same single entity;
for each of the plurality of input symbols, generate a normalized master symbol;
determine a unique parent symbol corresponding to the master symbols;
store the parent symbol and the plurality of master symbols in a master symbol database wherein each of the plurality of normalized master symbols is linked to the parent symbol.

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 41 and 42 have been added. Claims 1-42 are now pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-4, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,122,635 to Burakoff et al ("Burakoff"). Claims 5-11, 16-22 and 30-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burakoff in view of U.S. Patent 5,940,843 to Zucknovich et al. ("Zucknovich"). Claims 12, 13, 23-29 and 37-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burakoff in view of U.S. Patent 6,236,980 to Reese ("Reese").

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the presently pending claims are allowable in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

A. Claims 1-4, 14 and 15

In order to reject a claim for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, the prior art must teach or suggest each and every element of the claim and must also suggest combining the elements in the manner contemplated in the claim. See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F.2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied 111 S. Ct. 296 (1990); In re

Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

Claims 1-4, 14 and 15 stand rejected under ~~35 U.S.C. § 103(a)~~ as being unpatentable over Burakoff. Applicants respectfully submit that these rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 recites a method for storing and referencing symbolically linked information comprising the steps of:

processing a symbol to generate a master symbol;
determining a unique parent identifier corresponding to the master symbol;
storing the parent identifier and the master symbol in a master symbol database wherein the master symbol is linked to the parent identifier;
storing at least one information element wherein the at least one information element is linked to the parent identifier. (emphasis added).

Applicants' invention relates to a method and system for the reference, archival and retrieval of symbolically linked information in an environment of idiosyncratic symbol usage. As described in the specification, according to one embodiment of the present invention, a master symbol database stores a plurality of master symbols. Each master symbol in the master symbol database is linked to a parent identifier that identifies a unique object. Master symbols stored in the master symbol database are stored in a normalized format to provide a consistent method of referencing and searching the master symbol database.

Referring to FIG. 12, which depicts a set of steps for the creation of a master symbol database, a retrieved symbol is normalized according to a set of character rules. FIG. 10 depicts a data structure used in a normalization table database relating to various symbol sets. The function of the normalization table database is to assist in the normalization of input symbols provided by contributors and clients. Subsequent to the normalization, the normalized symbol is assigned a parent identifier. This is accomplished by determining the object corresponding to the symbol in object database. In step 1260, the normalized symbol is stored in the master symbol database. The parent identifier is then stored in the master symbol database so that it is linked to the master symbol.

For retrieval purposes, an input symbol is normalized and the master symbol database is searched to find a matching master symbol. The parent identifier linked to the matching master symbol is then used to retrieve or archive information in the information database.

Burakoff describes a computer-assisted method for manipulating securities information. According to Burakoff, one aspect of the invention is a computer-assisted method for manipulating securities information. The method includes the steps of acquiring securities information from one or more database sources, identifying one or more portions of the acquired securities information as relating to a particular security, and creating a computer-readable file having the identified portions. In Burakoff, an acquisition subsystem extracts files from a securities information source that contains securities information relevant to the subset of securities for which a user desires compliance information. In one embodiment, the securities submission source is first queried to extract all the files associated with a particular company. The company may be determined by its central index key or by the company name.

According to one embodiment, the identifying step includes matching a central index key to any of an internal identification number, a CUSIP number or a stock exchange ticker symbol, and determining if the identification number, CUSIP number or stock exchange ticker symbol relates to a particular security. In particular, in one embodiment, the securities submission source is first queried to extract all the files associated with a particular company. The company may be determined by its central index key, or by the company name. In another embodiment, the acquisition subsystem acquires documents automatically from EDGAR each day from an index of securities information added each day. The index lists a central index key associated with each item of securities information. The acquisition subsystem uses the index to automatically acquire the most recent information for a specific list of central index keys. The list of central index keys is determined from a list of securities having a unique identifier. For example, a list of securities identified by CUSIP number or stock ticker symbol can be mapped into a list of central index keys.

Burakoff notes that an internal identification number, CUSIP identifiers, and stock ticker symbols are used to identify a particular security. The internal identification number is unique for each security. A CUSIP number is a number assigned by Standard & Poor's CUSIP Service Bureau, to identify a security. A stock ticker symbol is a symbol assigned by a stock exchange to identify a security. An investor is likely to reference a security such as a mutual fund by the fund name marketed to the consumer, the CUSIP number, or the stock ticker symbol, not the investment company name or central index key.

Burakoff also describes a method for retrieving compliance information. The method

includes receiving an identifier unique to a particular security, and transmitting compliance information for the security specified by the identifier. In one embodiment, the identifier unique to a particular security is a CUSIP number. In another embodiment, the identifier unique to a particular security is a stock ticker symbol.

A cataloging subsystem presents a system operator with securities submissions that are relevant. The system operator inspects each submission and catalogs it according to the information contained within. The system operator identifies the particular securities about which the submission contains compliance information. An internal identification number, CUSIP identifiers and stock ticker symbols are used to identify a particular security. The internal identification number is unique for each security.

An indexer accesses the compliance information and the catalog information and identifies all compliance information associated with a particular security. A request to a compliance information server may come in the form of a unique identifier for the security, such as an internal identifier, a CUSIP or a stock ticker symbol. The indexer identifies the compliance information associated with that unique identifier. A method for responding to requests for compliance information includes receiving a unique identifier. The unique identifier can be a unique internal identifier, a CUSIP number or a stock ticker symbol. The method also includes transmitting compliance information in response to the unique identifier. The compliance information server is capable of accomplishing the steps of the method because the compliance information server has the compliance information and it can associate the compliance information with the particular security specified by the unique identifier.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, matching a central index key to any of an internal identification number, a CUSIP number or a stock exchange ticker symbol and determining if the identification number, CUSIP number or stock exchange ticker symbol relates to a particular security is not processing a symbol to generate a master symbol. In particular, Burakoff describes only matching a central index key to an internal identification number, a CUSIP number or stock exchange ticker symbol, but does not describe processing a symbol to generate a master symbol.

Furthermore, Burakoff does not teach or suggest storing both a master symbol and a parent identifier as recited in claim 1. Instead, Burakoff describes only the use of an internal identification number, CUSIP identifiers and stock ticker symbols to identify a particular

security. The central index key in Burakoff is not a master symbol. Namely, as recited in claim 1, the master symbol in the master symbol database is linked to a parent identifier that identifies a unique object whereas in Burakoff only an internal identification number, CUSIP identifiers and stock ticker symbols are used to identify a particular security. The internal identification number is unique for each security. Furthermore, Burakoff does not teach or suggest linking the identification number, CUSIP identifier and stock ticker symbols to a parent identifier.

Furthermore, since Burakoff does not teach or suggest storing both a parent identifier and a master symbol it could not have been obvious, as the Examiner contends, to have a master symbol database. Furthermore, receiving an identifier unique to a particular security is not equivalent to determining a unique parent identifier corresponding to the master symbol.

Thus, for the reasons stated above, the Examiner's §103 rejections of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1. Thus, for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, the Examiner's §103 rejections of claims 2-4 should be withdrawn.

Claims 14-15 are dependent on claim 12, which recites:

A method for the archival of symbolically linked information comprising the steps of:
receiving an information element and at least an input symbol;

processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol;

searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier; and

storing at least the parent identifier and the information element so that the parent identifier is linked to the information element.

(Emphasis added).

The Examiner admits that the Burkoff, alone, "did not explicitly teach, processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol or searching a master symbol database using a normalized symbol to find a matching symbol and linked parent identifier." See, Office Action, section 6. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Burkoff should be withdrawn.

Claims 5-11, 16-22 and 30-36

Claims 5-11 depend from claim 1 and thus the arguments presented above in

connection with Burkoff and claim 1 apply equally to claims 5-11. Zucknovich does not cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, the Examiner's rejections of claims 5-11 should be withdrawn.

Claims 16-22 depend from claim 12. As indicated, the Examiner admits that Burkoff, alone, does not teach "processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol or searching a master symbol database using a normalized symbol to find a matching symbol and linked parent identifier." Zucknovich does not cure these deficiencies. Thus, the Examiner's rejections of claims 16-22 should be withdrawn.

Claims 30-36 depend from claim 25. Claim 25 recites "processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol" and "searching a master symbol database to find a matching master symbol and a parent identifier linked to the master symbol." The Examiner admits that Burkoff, alone, does not teach these features. See Office Action, section 6. Zucknovich does not cure these deficiencies. Thus, the Examiner's rejection of claims 30-36 should be withdrawn.

Claims 12, 13, 23-29 and 37-40

Claim 12 relates to a method for the archival of symbolically linked information comprising the steps of:

receiving an information element and at least an input symbol;

processing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol;

searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier; and

storing at least the parent identifier and the information element so that the parent identifier is linked to the information element.

(Emphasis Added).

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Reese does not teach the step of processing an input symbol to generate a normalized symbol. Reese relates to a computer apparatus for automatically generating displays or reports containing investment security or element recommendations. According to Reese, the user selects a security by use of a security selection means. The computer apparatus then processes the request utilizing the programmed algorithms to construct the first subset of information. This first subset

consists of the recommendations for the security selected for the predetermined date range. The computer apparatus utilizes a Microsoft Access select query to construct the first subset. Through the utilization of the criteria based upon the selection of the user the selected query is able to retrieve just the recommendations for the security chosen for the predetermined date range. For example, if a user enters the ticker symbol WDC, the computer apparatus will retrieve from the Recommendation Data Set the recommendations captured for Western Digital (WDC). The first subset will consist of the unique ID number of the recommendations found within the Access database.

However, the use of a date restriction is not generating a normalized symbol as recited in claim 12. According to the example embodiment of applicant's invention, all master symbols stored in a master symbol database utilize a pre-defined structure (see, for example, FIG. 1a). Thus, for example, all master symbols stored in the master symbol database will be structured according to a same pre-determined symbol template. Master symbols stored in a master symbol database are stored in a normalized format to provide a consistent method for referencing and searching the master symbol database. Thus, for example, the symbol segment 'US' may be used for all master symbols stored in the master symbol database to refer to the United States.

Furthermore, neither Burakoff nor Reese alone or in combination teaches or suggests searching a master symbol database to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier. Thus, the Examiner's §103 rejections of claim 12 should be withdrawn. Claims 13 and 23-24 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 12. Thus, the Examiner's §103 rejections of claims 13 and 23-24 should be withdrawn.

Claim 25 includes features similar to claim 12. As Reese does not cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to claim 12, the Examiner's rejections of claims 25 should be withdrawn. Claims 26-29 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 12. Thus, the Examiner's rejections of claims 26-29 should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 37 and 39 relate to a document repository system and each includes features similar to those discussed with respect to claim 12. Thus, because Reese does not cure any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to claim 12, the Examiner's §103 rejections of claim 37 and claim 39 should be withdrawn. Claim 38 depends from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 37. Claim 40 depends

from and therefor includes all the limitations of claim 39. Thus, for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, the Examiner's §103 rejections of claims 37-38 and 39-40 should be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of pending claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 5, 2002

By: 

Michelle M. Carniaux
Reg. No. 36,098

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200